UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/862,612	05/23/2001	Michael J. Lemon	10012649-1	8359

7590   05/23/2005

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER
STEVENS, ROBERT

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

DATE MAILED: 05/23/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/862,612	LEMON ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Robert M Stevens	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _07 February 2005_.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
   closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-22_ is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) _6_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-5 and 7-22_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on _07 February 2005_ is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

   1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

   2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

   3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
       application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to communications: **Application No. 09/862,612** amendment

filed 2/7/2005 to the original application filed 5/23/2001 by Lemon et al. entitled "Light Weight

Dynamic Service Conversation Controller".

2.   The Office withdraws objections raised in the First Action on the Merits (FAOM)

concerning the specification, in light of the amendment.

3.   The Office withdraws objections to the drawings raised in the FAOM concerning Figure

1 and the lack of a connection/interface to Fig. 2, in light of the amendment.

4.   However, the Office maintains the objection to the drawings raised in the FAOM

concerning Figure 1 and the two paths shown from block #210 of the flow chart. First of all, one

reason for requiring figures is to enable one to quickly assess whether or not a further reading of

the specification is necessary (e.g., for prior art determination purposes). Thus requiring one to

"read the spec" in order to understand the figures is inappropriate. Secondly, a rectangular shape

(i.e., a box) in a flow chart by convention has at most one output. Applicant states that a

decision point is reached after block 210 (i.e., stateful v. stateless). One skilled in the art knows

that a diamond, by convention, represents a flow chart decision point. Therefore, by Applicant's

own admission, a step has been omitted in the Fig. 1 flow chart.

5.   The Office withdraws claims rejections under 35 USC 112 1st paragraph raised in the

FAOM, in light of the amendment.

6.   The Office withdraws claims rejections under 35 USC 101 raised in the FAOM, in light

of the amendment.

7.   The Office has substantially maintained the FAOM rejections of claims 1 and 4-18 under

35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stewart in view of Chiang, as necessitated by

amendment. New claims 21-22 have also been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Stewart in view of Chiang, as necessitated by amendment. See further

explanation below.

8.   The Office has substantially maintained the FAOM rejections of claims 2-3 and 19-20

under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stewart in view of Chiang and LeMay, as

necessitated by amendment.

9.   Claims 1-22 are pending. Claims 1, 11 and 16 are independent. Claim 6 has been

cancelled. Claims 21-22 are new.

Drawings

1. The Office objects to Figure 1.

2. **Regarding Fig. 1:** two paths are shown from block #210, which is NOT a decision point

(e.g., Y/N). It is unclear from the drawings, which path is to be traversed and when.

3. Corrected drawing sheets are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of

the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures

appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended.

The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a

drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement

sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes

made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional

replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. The

replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR

1.84(c) and 1.121(d)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are

not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required

corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in

abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness

rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

5. **Claims 1, 4-5, 7-18 and 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)** as being unpatentable

over Stewart et al (US Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0161688, relying upon

provisional applications filed Feb. 16 and Dec. 29, 2000, hereafter referred to as "Stewart") in

view of Chiang et al (US Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0221292, provisionally filed

Aug. 8, 2000, hereafter referred to as "Chiang").

Regarding independent claim 1, Stewart discloses:

> *A method for implementing a conversation between a client and a service on a conversation controller, comprising:*
>> *the conversation controller receiving a conversation information from the service, the conversion information specifying a structure of conversations supported by the service* (Fig. 23 #430, esp. "Transformation mappings");
>> *the conversation controller determining a current state of the conversation* ([0144], re: maintaining conversation status);
>> *the conversation controller using the received conversation information to determine valid input document types for the current state* ([0157] re: "knows how to handle the type of message received");
>> *the conversation controller verifying whether the message is of one of the valid input document types for the current state* ([0157] re: "knows how to handle the type of message received"); and
>> *the conversation controller dispatching the message to appropriate service entry points provided by the service, until the service produces an output document of a valid output document type.* ([0247] re: "selects a subset of <trading partner> nodes" and [0256] re: "until all filters return true")

However, Stewart does not explicitly disclose:

> *the conversation controller receiving a message on behalf of the service;*

Chiang, though, discloses:

the conversation controller receiving a message on behalf of the service;
(Abstract, especially the 2nd sentence)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

to apply the teachings of Chiang for the benefit of Stewart, because to do so would allow a

programmer to integrate dissimilar applications, as taught by Chiang in [0010]. These references

were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the transferring of eCommerce messages

among computer platforms.

Regarding claim 4, which is dependent upon claim 1, the limitations of claim 1 have

been previously addressed.

However, Stewart does not explicitly disclose:

> *further comprising the conversation controller formatting and returning to the client the output document in a form appropriate to the client.*

Chiang, though, discloses:

> *further comprising the conversation controller formatting and returning to the client the output document in a form appropriate to the client.* (Abstract, re: (ii) converting from server format/source language to end user format/target language)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

to apply the teachings of Chiang for the benefit of Stewart, because to do so would allow a

programmer to integrate dissimilar applications, as taught by Chiang in [0010]. These references

were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the transferring of eCommerce messages

among computer platforms.

     Regarding claim 5, which is dependent upon claim 1, the limitations of claim 1 have

been previously addressed.

     Stewart further discloses:

> *the conversation controller calculating a new state of the conversation*
> *from the valid output document type;* ([0144] re: maintains conversation status)

     However, Stewart does not explicitly disclose:

> *the conversation controller determining new input document types that are*
> *valid in the new state; and*
>   *the conversation controller prompting for the new input document types*
> *that are valid in the new state.*

     Chiang, though, discloses:

> *the conversation controller determining new input document types that are*
> *valid in the new state;* ([0031] re: invoking type descriptor ... of source and target
> languages ....) *and*
>   *the conversation controller prompting for the new input document types*
> *that are valid in the new state.* ([0031] re: invoking type descriptor ... of source
> and target languages ....)

     It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

to apply the teachings of Chiang for the benefit of Stewart, because to do so would allow a

programmer to integrate dissimilar applications, as taught by Chiang in [0010]. These references

were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the transferring of eCommerce messages

among computer platforms.

Regarding claim 7, which is dependent upon claim 1, the limitations of claim 1 have

been previously addressed.

Stewart further discloses:

> *further comprising the conversation controller maintaining a "state" of*
> *the conversation.* ([0144] re: maintains conversation status)

Regarding claim 8, which is dependent upon claim 1, the limitations of claim 1 have

been previously addressed.

Stewart further discloses:

> *further comprising the conversation controller retrieving a "state" of the*
> *conversation from the service.* ([0144] re: maintains conversation status)

Regarding claim 9, which is dependent upon claim 1, the limitations of claim 1 have

been previously addressed.

Stewart further discloses:

> *the conversation controller calculating a new state of the conversation*
> *from the valid output document type;* ([0144] re: maintains conversation status)
> *and*
> *the conversation controller invoking client methods that can produce new*
> *input documents that are valid in the new state.* ([0162] re: business logic plug-
> ins)

Regarding claim 10, which is dependent upon claim 9, the limitations of claim 9 have

been previously addressed.

However, Stewart does not explicitly disclose:

> *further comprising the conversation controller sending the new input*
> *documents to the service.*

Chiang, though, discloses:

> *further comprising the conversation controller sending the new input*
> *documents to the service.* (Abstract, especially the 2nd sentence)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

to apply the teachings of Chiang for the benefit of Stewart, because to do so would allow a

programmer to integrate dissimilar applications, as taught by Chiang in [0010]. These references

were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the transferring of eCommerce messages

among computer platforms.

Regarding independent claim 11, Stewart discloses:

> *A conversation controller that implements a conversation between a client and a*
> *service, comprising:*
>   *a processor* ([0303] – [0304], esp. "XML Processing");
>   *... , wherein the incoming context handler is capable of parsing the*
> *message and extracting a document type of the message* ([0109], re: processing
> protocol specific headers);
>   *an interaction handler executing on said processor* ([0303] – [0304], esp.
> "XML Processing", it being inherent/implicit that a software module executes on
> a processor) *and coupled to the incoming context handler and capable of*
> *identifying a current state* ([0144], re: maintaining conversation status), *and*
> *validates the document type based on a ... received from the service* (Fig. 19 #516
> and [0270] – [0294] disclose document type/conversation validation); *and*
>   *a dispatch handler executing on said processor* ([0303] – [0304], esp.
> "XML Processing", it being inherent/implicit that a software module executes on
> a processor), *wherein the dispatch handler parses* (Fig. 21, re: C-Hub router) *the*
> *... and forwards the message to service entry points of the service* (Fig. 21, re: C-
> Hub transport).

However, Stewart does not explicitly disclose:

> *an incoming context handler executing on said processor, said incoming*
> *context handler receives a message on behalf of the service, ... ;*

> ... ;
> ... , *conversation specification* ...; *and*
> ... *conversation specification* ... .

Chiang, though, discloses:

> *an incoming context handler executing on said processor, said incoming context handler receives a message on behalf of the service* (Abstract, especially the 2nd sentence), ... ;
> ... ;
> ... , *conversation specification* ([0031] re: type descriptor and language metamodels) ...; *and*
> ... *conversation specification* ([0031] re: type descriptor and language metamodels) ... .

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Chiang for the benefit of Stewart, because to do so would allow a programmer to integrate dissimilar applications, as taught by Chiang in [0010]. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the transferring of eCommerce messages among computer platforms.

Regarding claim 12, which is dependent upon claim 11, the limitations of claim 11 have been previously addressed.

Stewart further discloses:

> *wherein the interaction handler validates if the document type of the message is valid for the current state.* ([0144] re: maintains conversation status)

Regarding claim 13, which is dependent upon claim 11, the limitations of claim 11 have been previously addressed.

Stewart further discloses:

> *wherein the interaction handler calculates a new state of the conversation*
> ([0144] re: maintains conversation status) *and ... .*

However, Stewart does not explicitly disclose:

> *... and new valid document types for the new state from a response*
> *returned by the service.*

Chiang, though, discloses:

> *... and new valid document types for the new state from a response*
> *returned by the service.* ([0031] re: invoking type descriptor ... of source and
> target languages)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

to apply the teachings of Chiang for the benefit of Stewart, because to do so would allow a

programmer to integrate dissimilar applications, as taught by Chiang in [0010]. These references

were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the transferring of eCommerce messages

among computer platforms.

Regarding claim 14, which is dependent upon claim 13, the limitations of claim

13 have been previously addressed.

Stewart further discloses:

> *wherein the interaction handler validates if the document type of the*
> *message is valid for the current state.* (Fig. 21 #422 re: XOCP MSGENCODER)

Regarding claim 15, which is dependent upon claim 11, the limitations of claim 11 have

been previously addressed.

Stewart further discloses:

> *further comprising a client interaction handler that dispatches a reply*
> *from the service to the client and forwards a response from the client to the*
> *service.* (Fig. 21 re: "C-Hub Transport")

Regarding independent claim 16, Stewart discloses:

> *A computer readable medium comprising instructions for implementing a*
> *conversation between a client and a service, the instructions comprising:*
> > *receiving a ... from the service, the conversation specification specifying a*
> *structure of conversations supported by the service* (Fig. 23 #430, esp.
> "Transformation Mappings");
> > *determining a current state of the conversation* ([0144], re: maintaining
> conversation status);
> > *using ..., determining valid input document types for the current state*
> ([0157] re: "knows how to handle the type of message received");
> > *verifying whether the message is of one of the valid input document types*
> *for the current state* ([0157] re: "knows how to handle the type of message
> received"); *and*
> > *dispatching the message to appropriate service entry points provided by*
> *the service, until the service produces an output document of a valid output*
> *document type.* ([0247] re; "selects a subset of <trading partner> nodes" and
> [0256] re: "until all filters return true")

However, Stewart does not explicitly disclose:

> *... conversation specification ... ;*
> *receiving a message on behalf of the service;*
> *... conversation specification ... ;*

Chiang, though, discloses:

... conversation specification ... ; ([0031] re: type descriptor and language metamodels)

receiving a message on behalf of the service; (Abstract, especially the 2nd sentence)

... conversation specification ... ; ([0031] re: type descriptor and language metamodels)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Chiang for the benefit of Stewart, because to do so would allow a programmer to integrate dissimilar applications, as taught by Chiang in [0010]. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the transferring of eCommerce messages among computer platforms.

Regarding claim 17, this claim is substantially similar to claim 4, and therefore likewise rejected.

Regarding claim 18, this claim is substantially similar to claim 5, and therefore likewise rejected.

Regarding claim 21, which is dependent upon claim 1, the limitations of claim 1 have been previously addressed.

Stewart further discloses:

the conversation controller receiving a ... from the client defining the valid interactions with the client. (Fig. 7 #196)

However, Stewart does not explicitly disclose:

... conversation specification ... .

Chiang, though, discloses:

> *... conversation specification ... .* ([0031] re: type descriptor and language metamodels)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Chiang for the benefit of Stewart, because to do so would allow a programmer to integrate dissimilar applications, as taught by Chiang in [0010]. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the transferring of eCommerce messages among computer platforms.

Regarding claim 22, which is dependent upon claim 16, the limitations of claim 16 have been previously addressed.

Stewart further discloses:

> *wherein the instructions further comprise receiving a ... from the client defining the valid interactions with the client.* (Fig. 7 #196)

However, Stewart does not explicitly disclose:

> *... conversation specification ... .*

Chiang, though, discloses:

> *... conversation specification ... .* ([0031] re: type descriptor and language metamodels)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

to apply the teachings of Chiang for the benefit of Stewart, because to do so would allow a

programmer to integrate dissimilar applications, as taught by Chiang in [0010]. These references

were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the transferring of eCommerce messages

among computer platforms.

6. **Claims 2-3 and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)** as being unpatentable over

Stewart et al (US Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0161688, relying upon provisional

applications filed Feb. 16 and Dec. 29, 2000, hereafter referred to as "Stewart") in view of

Chiang et al (US Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0221292, provisionally filed Aug. 8,

2000, hereafter referred to as "Chiang") and further in view of Laura LeMay et al (Sams Teach

Yourself Java 2 in 21 Days, Sams Publishing, Indianapolis, IN, © 1999, pp. 422-430, hereafter

referred to as "LeMay")

Regarding claim 2, which is dependent upon claim 1, the limitations of claim 1 have

been previously addressed.

Stewart further discloses:

> *wherein if messages of invalid input documents types are received* ([0144]
> re: errors), ...

However, Stewart does not explicitly disclose:

> *... , further comprising the conversation controller raising exceptions.*

LeMay, though, discloses:

> ... , *further comprising the conversation controller raising exceptions.*
> (Throwing exceptions is a well known programming practice. See the p. 426
> section entitled "Throwing Exceptions")

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

to apply the teachings of LeMay for the benefit of Stewart in view of Chiang, because to do so

would enable a programmer to handle different types of errors (including custom exceptions), as

taught by LeMay in the first paragraph under section "Creating Your Own Exceptions" on p.

427. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., object oriented

programming.

Regarding claim 3, which is dependent upon claim 1, the limitations of claim 1 have

been previously addressed.

Stewart further discloses:

> *wherein if no valid output document is produced by the service* ([0144] re:
>
> errors), ...

However, Stewart does not explicitly disclose:

> ... , *further comprising the conversation controller raising exceptions.*

LeMay, though, discloses:

> ... , *further comprising the conversation controller raising exceptions.*
> (Throwing exceptions is a well known programming practice. See the p. 426
> section entitled "Throwing Exceptions")

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

to apply the teachings of LeMay for the benefit of Stewart in view of Chiang, because to do so

would enable a programmer to handle different types of errors (including custom exceptions), as

taught by LeMay in the first paragraph under section "Creating Your Own Exceptions" on p.

427. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., object oriented

programming.

Regarding claims 19-20, these claims are substantially similar to claims 2-3,

respectively, and therefore likewise rejected.

Response to Arguments

10.　　Applicant's arguments filed 11/29/2004 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive.

Applicant's remarks on pages 10-12 of the amendment concerning the "Drawings",

"Specification", "Rejection of Claims Under 35 USC 101" and "Rejection of Claims Under 35

USC 112 2nd paragraph" raised in the FAOM, have been addressed above.

Regarding the FAOM rejections of independent claim 1 (and thus all claims dependent

upon claim 1) under 35 USC 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Stewart in view of Chiang,

Applicant argues that the referenced passage in Stewart [0151] does not teach "verifying whether

the message is of one of the valid input document types for the current state". Additionally,

Applicant argues that the amendment has been modified to state that actions are performed by a

"conversation controller".

However, the Office first notes by implication, if the discussed decoder knows how to

handle the message, it, perforce, must be for the current state and a valid document type. The

Office therefore maintains the FAOM rejections of 1 and 4-18 under 35 USC 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Stewart in view of Chiang, and adds the rejections of new claims 21-22 using

the same art. Additionally, the Office notes that providing a name for an element such as a

software module (or dividing up tasks to be performed by a certain named module) does not

impart patentability. The issue is whether the function(s) performed by a named module (and not

the Applicant-assigned name of the module) are shown to exist in the prior art. These functions

have been cited above. The Office therefore maintains the FAOM rejections of 1 and 4-18 under

35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stewart in view of Chiang, and adds the rejections of

new claims 21-22 using the same art.

Conclusion

11.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure.

Non-patent Literature

Casalicchio, Emiliano, et al., "A Client-Aware Dispatching Algorithm for Web
Clusters Providing Multiple Services", WWW10, Hong Kong, May 1-5, 2001, pp. 535-
544 [ACM 1-58113-348-0/01/0005].

Hodes, Todd D., et al., "Composable ad hoc location-based services for
heterogeneous mobile clients", Wireless Networks, J.C. Baltzer AG, Science Publishers,
© 1999, pp. 411-427.

Beck, Micah, et al., "Enabling Full Service Surrogates Using the Portable
Channel Representation", WWW10, Hong Kong, May 1-5, 2001, pp. 376-385 [ACM 1-
58113-348-0/01/0005].

US Patent Application Publications

Brouk et al	US2003/0053459
Singhal et al	US2002/0178211
Ben-Shaul et al	US2002/0010798
Bellinger et al	US2002/0169858
Hutsch et al	US2001/0034771

US Patents

Meltzer et al	6,226,675
Lee et al	6,336,137
Kawaguchi et al	6,154,782

12.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this

Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this

final action.

13.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the   .

examiner should be directed to Robert M Stevens whose telephone number is (571) 272-4102.

The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6:00 - 2:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Joseph H. Feild can be reached on (571) 272-4090. The current fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Additionally, the main number for Technology Center 2100 is (571) 272-2100.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Robert M. Stevens
Reg. No. 47,972
Art Unit 2176
Date: May 11, 2005

rms

WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER
5/16/2005